

May 26, 2017

Gary Fuller, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Falls Church
Department of Planning
300 Park Avenue
Falls Church, VA 22046

Re: Broad and Washington (Munis #2015-0764)
Response to Comments dated May 19, 2017

Dear Gary:

On behalf of our client, Broad & Washington LLC, we hereby submit the following responses to the Comments dated May 19, 2017 to the 3rd Submission:

Comment 1. **Massing, Design, and Architecture** – While the overall massing design for the project has improved, greater step backs and lesser heights should be sought for better transition with the adjacent low density residential neighborhood on Lawton Street.

The E. Broad Street frontage is approximately 575 feet in length. The proposed breaks in the massing, such as the two 2nd floor courtyards; three distinct architectural themes; and the proposed step back at 65 feet along Lawton Street serve to provide reliefs in the perceived massing of the building. Further step backs, greater articulations and modulations for portions of the building along the north and northeast property lines adjacent to the Lawton Street residential community should be considered.

Park Place Elevation

The City Design Guidelines call for “attractive façade treatments on any elevation that is visible from streets or from any primary elevations of adjoining developments and avoiding the use of unadorned blank walls.” Based on the limited number of views and perspectives provided in the architectural packet, the north elevation facing Park Place appears to lack a sense of visual interest and complexity. Given the minimal windows

offered along this elevation due to building code constraints, and the lack of adequate modulations the overall composition assumes a solid wall appearance. Consider providing design elements that adds visual interest to break away from monotonous appearance of the façade. Articulations, modulations and other architectural expressions that provide greater reliefs should be explored.

Currently there is an existing landscape buffer along the property line between the City parking lot and the project site. The proposal shows a zero-foot setback from the property line eliminating most of the existing landscape buffer and potentially impacting the parking space layout on the City lot. While the City Code does not require a buffer or a setback along the northern property line where the site abuts another B-2 district, setting back the building to provide some spatial relief for parking space layout and landscaping opportunities should be considered.

The applicant's architect should provide a more in-depth narrative design rationale on how the proposed buildings reflect and are complementary of Falls Church and the immediately surrounding neighborhoods.

Response: The Applicant has worked diligently to address the City and neighbor comments regarding the proposed building massing. Regarding the West Broad Street frontage, the current submission creates breaks in the building massing through the use of courtyards that create 3 distinct building forms.

On Lawton Street, the building form, height, and setbacks have changed significantly since the initial submission. The originally submitted plans showed heights ranging from 65-76 feet on Lawton Street, along with a 14' setback from the street and a 20 foot setback from the northern property line. In March 2017, the project was revised to reduce the height on Lawton Street and increase setbacks. In that submission a floor was removed from the Lawton Street side of the building, which reduced the height to between 57-65 feet. Additionally, the setback from Lawton Street was increased to a minimum of 24 feet 10 inches and a maximum of 26 feet. The setback from the northern property line was also increased to 42 feet, which is over double the minimum required setback. In the current submission, an additional level has been removed from the most sensitive portion of Lawton Street, which further reduced the height of the main building to 45 feet. A further stepdown to 20 feet is provided at the corner of E. Broad Street and Lawton Street. That step-down to one story includes a portion of the Creative Cauldron space and includes a balcony

on top.

The Special Exception criteria in Section 48-488 provide that “The height of all structures within a special exception project that abut an R district must be tapered to be compatible with the maximum heights permitted in the abutting R district, taking into consideration the height of existing buildings in that area.” The maximum height in the adjacent R district is 35 feet. The proposed Lawton Street frontage includes two step-backs. The first step back is to 20 feet. The second step-back is to 45 feet, which is still 10 feet below the maximum height under the current T-1 district. The proposed height and massing, with multiple step-backs, is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements and compatible with the maximum 35 foot height in the adjacent residential neighborhood.

The Park Place façade has been enhanced to reflect greater architectural design through the use of “at-risk” windows. Additionally, the façade includes a variety of materials, colors, and depth to create visual interest. Finally, the Voluntary Concessions include a commitment to provide public art on this façade.

Comment 2.

Height, setbacks, and step backs – The proposed step back at 65 feet along the Lawton Street elevation is an improvement. However, the proposed building heights for portions of the project in the current T-1 zoned parcel are still excessive. Additionally, the Park Place building elevation has minimal modulation or step backs with a solid wall appearance as mentioned earlier.

Future submissions will need to consider greater buffering, step backs, and heights consistent with a Transitional zoned parcel in those areas of the project site along the east property line adjacent to the Lawton Street residential neighborhood. Furthermore, the requirement for appropriate step backs for any height bonus consideration in a B-2 district that abuts an R-district is applicable for portions of the site along east elevations adjacent to R-district. The proposed building height along Lawton provides a step back at approximately 65 feet. Additional step backs should be provided at 35 feet (or adjacent structure height). Additionally, the heights of all structures abutting an R-district are to be “tapered to be compatible with the maximum allowed heights, in both districts.” [§48-488(2)a]

Response:

On Lawton Street, the building form, height, and setbacks have changed significantly since the initial submission. The originally submitted plans showed heights ranging from 65-76 feet on Lawton Street, along with a 14’

setback from the street and a 20 foot setback from the northern property line. In March 2017, the project was revised to reduce the height on Lawton Street and increase setbacks. In that submission a floor was removed from the Lawton Street side of the building, which reduced the height to between 57-65 feet. Additionally, the setback from Lawton Street was increased to a minimum of 24 feet 10 inches and a maximum of 26 feet. The setback from the northern property line was also increased to 42 feet, which is over double the minimum required setback. In the current submission, an additional level has been removed from the most sensitive portion of Lawton Street, which further reduced the height of the main building to 45 feet. A further stepdown to 20 feet is provided at the corner of E. Broad Street and Lawton Street. That step-down to one story includes a portion of the Creative Cauldron space and includes a balcony on top.

The Special Exception criteria in Section 48-488 provide that “The height of all structures within a special exception project that abut an R district must be tapered to be compatible with the maximum heights permitted in the abutting R district, taking into consideration the height of existing buildings in that area.” The maximum height in the adjacent R district is 35 feet. The proposed Lawton Street frontage includes two step-backs. The first step back is to 20 feet. The second step-back is to 45 feet, which is still 10 feet below the maximum height under the current T-1 district. The proposed height and massing, with multiple step-backs, is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements and compatible with the maximum 35 foot height in the adjacent residential neighborhood.

Comment 3.

Connectivity between proposed development and City public parking lot/Mid-block access [§48-1140(1) & (2)] – The pedestrian path proposed along the perimeter of the site offers a connection along the east edge of the site between East Broad Street and the City parking lot. The addition of a safe mid-block public access pathway between E. Broad Street and the public parking and ultimately to Park Place within the project site should be strongly considered. All proposed mid-block pedestrian entrances on East Broad are just that, pedestrian entrance that terminate within the project and does not connect to the City parking lot.

The proposed stairs labeled Potential Stair Connection to Neighboring Restaurants (page 18) located on the north side of the parking garage is a positive addition to the project that helps to connect the project to existing business to the north. However, there should be a thoughtfully designed

pedestrian connection from the pedestrian access point from Broad Street to the stairwell. As proposed now, the stairwell appears to be isolated from all the pedestrian access points from Broad and Washington. It is also unclear if any ADA accessible routes will be provided to the neighboring uses to the north.

An example of an interior public pathway is the new West Broad development at 301 W. Broad Street. An example of an exterior public pathway is located in the Spectrum development at the 400 block of W. Broad Street.

Response: The pedestrian connections between Broad and Washington and the City parking lot have been enhanced significantly. The entrance from the proposed parking garage to the City parking lot includes significant wayfinding signage and an open inviting design that will encourage pedestrian connectivity between the properties. Additionally, pedestrian paths are stripped out in the parking garage to provide a pathway from E. Broad Street to the City parking lot. The overall pedestrian connectivity is shown on the updated exhibits on Page 6 of the SE Booklet. ADA accessible routes to neighboring uses are provided on the public sidewalks.

Comment 4: **Lawton Street frontage** – The potential impact to Lawton Street is seen as significant and the applicable building setback should be provided.

The proposed reduction of the Lawton Street building setback from the required 14 feet to 10 feet along Lawton Street would require a variance request [§48-1101]. The importance of compatibility of building scale and appropriate transition along Lawton Street with respect to the adjacent R district should be considered.

Response: The Lawton Street frontage has been strongly considered and discussed with City staff. The proposed building is setback a minimum of 22 feet from the edge of curb, which we believe is an appropriate and compatible setback from Lawton Street. Additionally, the Zoning Ordinance Section 48-1101 note 11 provides that front yard setbacks are “20 feet for commercially-zoned properties (B, M, T) with frontage on the following streets: Broad Street and Washington Street. These requirements may be reduced; by the planning commission as part of a site plan review or by city council as part of a special exception. Distance shall be measured from the face of the curb, to the narrowest point of the face of the building.” This property is seeking zoning to the B-2 zoning district and is therefore commercially zoned. Additionally, the property has frontage on Broad

Street and Washington Street. Under a plain reading of the zoning ordinance, the property has a required front yard setback of 20 feet measured from the face of curb to the narrowest point of the face of building.

Our review of prior City approvals for Mason Row, Rushmark, The Reserve at Tinner Hill, and the Kensington show that this is the consistent application the setback requirements for properties with frontage on Broad Street and Washington Street. In each of the above cited cases, the building setback was less than 14 feet from the property line on the non-Broad/Washington street frontages. We are not aware of any variances that were required for those properties and the approved setbacks. If we are incorrect and variances were approved, could you please forward us copies of those variances. This project should receive the same application of the zoning ordinance as the prior projects which are all similarly situated.

We have continued to include a variance request related to the Lawton Street frontage at your request, but do not believe such a variance is needed based upon the plain language of the ordinance.

Comment 5. **Public access and community space** [§48-1140(1) & (2)]. – The proposed public access needs to be improved and provisions for additional public access as well as public/community space incorporated into the project.

The at-grade pedestrian access into Retail & Public Parking garage level (page 18) from Broad between the residential building and the office runs adjacent to a loading space. Potential conflicts between truck and pedestrian movements should be considered to ensure pedestrian safety. Additionally, the pedestrian sidewalk shown from N. Washington Street into the garage level (page 18) would place pedestrians at the base of the vehicle access ramp. Safe pedestrian circulations should be provided in these areas.

A meaningful public open space within the project that is visible to pedestrians from the street level should be considered on ground level. Additionally, the rooftop terrace between the office building and the residential building should be explored for public space.

Response: As shown in the SE Booklet, additional details on the pedestrian connectivity in the garage are provided. Those details include improved wayfinding signage and a clear demarcation of pedestrian pathways through the garage. While we believe providing that pedestrian

connectivity through the garage is important, we also believe the most important areas for pedestrian connectivity are the public sidewalks. By directing pedestrians to the public sidewalks the City will see benefits in the form of increased street activity and vibrancy. Additionally, increased pedestrian activity on public sidewalks is directly correlated to ensuring the proposed retail and restaurant uses are successful. We firmly believe that while a connection through the parking garage provides benefits for a limited group of pedestrians walking to the Beach Shack/Argias, those connections should be considered secondary paths and that pedestrians should be encouraged to use the public sidewalks to help support ground floor commercial uses and the overall vibrancy of the area.

Comment 6. **Streetscape Design Standards for Commercial Streets** – the proposed streetscape along North Washington and East Broad is not consistent with the recently adopted standards. See comments below for further details.

Response: The plans have been revised to fully address the streetscape requirements in the base condition. As discussed, an alternative showing on-street parking on E. Broad Street is included. Under that alternative, modifications to the streetscape standards will be required. However, the alternative will only be implemented if the City approves on-street parking.

Comment 7. **Public Parking** – the Rezoning and the Special Exceptions book states that no public parking is provided within the parking garage. However, the Downtown Falls Church Small Area Plan states that “a major component to creating a regional destination will be to allow visitors to park once and then visit multiple venues within the POA. This will necessitate consolidated, centrally located parking structures and strong pedestrian connections. The construction of public and private parking structures should be coordinated with pedestrian and bicycle improvements in the immediate area”. The incorporation of public parking during certain times, a validation system, or other techniques, should be considered.

Response: The applicant anticipates implementing a paid parking system for the site. The paid parking system would be controlled access and potentially provide validation for customers visiting business on-site. For others wishing to park, a fee would imposed.

Comment 8. **Shared parking analysis** – The Updated Shared Parking Study, prepared by Walker Parking Consultants, discusses operational assumptions that led

to their parking capacity recommendations. What mechanisms will be employed to ensure that the recommended 600 parking spaces will be sufficient?

Response: The applicant anticipates managing the parking themselves or through a third-party to ensure that adequate parking is provided for all uses.

Comment 9. **Transportation Demand Management Plan** – TDM requirements are now formalized in Ord. 1946 (Sec.48-970) as well as revised off-street parking requirements for office and retail uses (Sec. 48-1004). All future submissions will need to incorporate the requirements of Ord. 1946 and respond to comments below under Transportation Planning. Please schedule a meeting with our Transportation Planning team for their guidance on the TDM.

Response: The applicant has reached out to City staff regarding a meeting on the TDM plan.

Comment 10. **On-street parking on Broad Street** – while there is general support for the concept in the Comprehensive Plan, the potential for impacts on vehicular movement on Broad and the substantial reduction in the streetscape width will need to be considered. Without a comprehensive approach of implementing on-street parking on Broad, it is unclear to staff whether it will be successful here considering the potential impacts. As such, staff recommends that on-street parking be eliminated from the proposed plans.

Additionally, the 20 foot setback along Broad and Washington Streets is measured from the face of curb, existing and/or proposed. Any potential reduction in streetscape width and 10-foot clear pedestrian way that may be impacted by on-street parking will need to be considered. Where proposed parking spaces are shown on the CDP, the streetscape area is between 14 feet to 15 feet, and with streetscape elements reduce the pedestrian walkways down to 5 feet in some areas. This is not consistent with the newly adopted Streetscape Standards for Commercial Streets that calls for streetscape width of 20 feet with 9 – 10 feet of walk zone.

Response: The plans have been revised to fully address the streetscape requirements in the base condition. As discussed, an alternative showing on-street parking on E. Broad Street is included. Under that alternative,

modifications to the streetscape standards will be required. However, the alternative will only be implemented if the City approves on-street parking.

Comment 11. **Commercial Density** – The increase in the proposed office square footage from 33,400 to 66,700 square feet is a positive change. However, the potential impact of losing a grocery tenant will need be evaluated further as review of the project and the proposed Voluntary Concessions continues. The proposed residential density and the requested bonus building height of 15 feet are primary factors in the perceived massing and scale of the project. The City's current Future Land Use plan and Zoning designates this site for business uses only.

The Comprehensive Plan describes the Business Future Land Use designation as areas that may redevelop with residential and commercial uses, but that should remain predominantly commercial in character. The Downtown Falls Church Small Area Plan includes the project site in the Core Entertainment Area (CEA), which is a focused area of dense retail businesses with supporting residential and hotel space. Some residential use is acceptable in the CEA in the form of loft apartments above retail establishments. Therefore, it is recommended that a significant reduction in the overall residential density be considered. The addition of a community theater as a potential use is consistent with the goals of the Area Plan. Stronger retail uses on the ground floor level should continue to be explored as review of Voluntary Concessions continues.

Response: This project proposes the most significant, Class A, office building in the City. As discussed, we believe in the City's office market. However, the ability to actually deliver on the proposed office, commercial, and theater space is completely dependent upon the critical mass of residential being proposed. This project works because of the complementary uses being proposed. If the residential component of the project is reduced, the office, retail, and theater components as proposed are no longer viable.

Insight Property Group has a history of providing high quality retail environments that enhance the overall community. The anticipated retail program at Broad and Washington will continue Insight's long term track record.

Comment 12. **Zoning Map (Rezoning) and Comprehensive Plan - Future Land Use Plan Map, Amendments** -- Staff consideration of the Applicant's

justification will be evaluated on the type of uses proposed for the project site that are compatible with the existing neighborhood and residential areas in scale, height and character. Any meaningful justification for the proposed rezoning of the currently T-1 zone to B-2 should be accompanied by adequate buffer, step backs and setbacks for portions of the building abutting R districts as mentioned earlier. Similarly, justification for the Comprehensive Plan will also be evaluated based on how the proposed mixed-use project fits in with the overall fabric of the surrounding area and the compatibility of the uses proposed, with the adjacent neighborhoods.

Response: As discussed above, the project is designed to be compatible from a height and massing standpoint with the adjacent R Districts. The building is setback 42 feet (double the required setback) on the northern property line and at least 24 feet, 10 inches on Lawton Street. Additionally, the building contains numerous height step-backs on Lawton Street, including at 20 feet and 45 feet. This project will be an asset to Falls Church and fits within the overall fabric of the surrounding area.

Comment 13. **Special Exception(s)** - As part of the “exemplary” evaluation requirements in Section 48-488 of the City code, buildings heights adjacent to existing R districts must be stepped back at the maximum height (35 feet) of that zoning district. With the proposed building height bonus and the overall size, the project will need to explore further design strategies to reduce the perceived mass of the structure, particular along Lawton Street. While the current submission does provide an improved transition to the adjacent residential neighborhood, further reduction of the height and scale to address issues concerning incompatibility should be considered. Architectural treatments that may offer visual reduction in scale can only do so to a limited extent relative to actually reducing the mass by reducing density and thereby eliminating floors.

Response: On Lawton Street, the building form, height, and setbacks have changed significantly since the initial submission. The originally submitted plans showed heights ranging from 65-76 feet on Lawton Street, along with a 14’ setback from the street and a 20 foot setback from the northern property line. In March 2017, the project was revised to reduce the height on Lawton Street and increase setbacks. In that submission a floor was removed from the Lawton Street side of the building, which reduced the height to between 57-65 feet. Additionally, the setback from Lawton Street was increased to a minimum of 24 feet 10 inches and a maximum of 26

feet. The setback from the northern property line was also increased to 42 feet, which is over double the minimum required setback. In the current submission, an additional level has been removed from the most sensitive portion of Lawton Street, which further reduced the height of the main building to 45 feet. A further stepdown to 20 feet is provided at the corner of E. Broad Street and Lawton Street. That step-down to one story includes a portion of the Creative Cauldron space and includes a balcony on top.

The Special Exception criteria in Section 48-488 provide that “The height of all structures within a special exception project that abut an R district must be tapered to be compatible with the maximum heights permitted in the abutting R district, taking into consideration the height of existing buildings in that area.” The maximum height in the adjacent R district is 35 feet. The proposed Lawton Street frontage includes two step-backs. The first step back is to 20 feet. The second step-back is to 45 feet, which is still 10 feet below the maximum height under the current T-1 district. The proposed height and massing, with multiple step-backs, is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements and compatible with the maximum 35 foot height in the adjacent residential neighborhood.

Planning/Development Review

Comment 14. Sheet 2.0: The waivers requested to Sec. 48-1101, for setback along Lawton Street (from 14 feet to 10 feet), and to Sec. 48-1102(j)(1) for placement of utility, require variances rather than modifications. Also, the written request for placement of utility in the required yard references the plans. The proposed location will need be shown on the CDP. If the variances are sought in future submissions they should be listed on the CDP with explanations of the extent of the variance and reason requested. Refer to the Zoning Administrator’s comments below for additional comments and the processing procedure.

Response: The Lawton Street frontage has been strongly considered and discussed with City staff. The proposed building is setback a minimum of 22 feet from the edge of curb, which we believe is an appropriate and compatible setback from Lawton Street. Additionally, the Zoning Ordinance Section 48-1101 note 11 provides that front yard setbacks are “20 feet for commercially-zoned properties (B, M, T) with frontage on the following streets: Broad Street and Washington Street. These requirements may be

reduced; by the planning commission as part of a site plan review or by city council as part of a special exception. Distance shall be measured from the face of the curb, to the narrowest point of the face of the building.” This property is seeking zoning to the B-2 zoning district and is therefore commercially zoned. Additionally, the property has frontage on Broad Street and Washington Street. Under a plain reading of the zoning ordinance, the property has a required front yard setback of 20 feet measured from the face of curb to the narrowest point of the face of building.

Our review of prior City approvals for Mason Row, Rushmark, The Reserve at Tinner Hill, and the Kensington show that this is the consistent application the setback requirements for properties with frontage on Broad Street and Washington Street. In each of the above cited cases, the building setback was less than 14 feet from the property line on the non-Broad/Washington street frontages. We are not aware of any variances that were required for those properties and the approved setbacks. If we are incorrect and variances were approved, could you please forward us copies of those variances. This project should receive the same application of the zoning ordinance as the prior projects which are all similarly situated.

We have continued to include a variance request related to the Lawton Street frontage at your request, but do not believe such a variance is needed based upon the plain language of the ordinance.

Comment 15. Sheets C2.0 and C9.0: These sheets should indicate clearly those parking spaces/areas/levels proposed for restriction and/or sharing.

Response: Acknowledged and included in the updated plan.

Comment 16. Sheet C4.0: Indicate material and design of the area shown between the sidewalk and the landscape buffer proposed between the site and R-1A parcel to the north. A six foot wood fence, approximately 12 feet in length, is proposed where the existing brick screening wall ends to the west of the buffer. What is the rationale for the wood fence for this section rather than extending existing brick wall to complete the screening?

Response: A brick screening wall extending to the edge of the buffer is now proposed.

Comment 17. Sheet C4.0: Changes are proposed to the existing median along Washington Street which includes two existing trees. These trees should be

included in the tree inventory and appropriate mitigation provided if removal is required.

Response: The existing trees are not anticipated to be removed as part of the current plans.

Comment 18. Sheet C4.0: As shown on CDP existing conditions sheet C3.0, there is an existing landscape planter straddling the lot line between the City lot and the project site that serves as a landscape buffer. The proposed building sits right up against the lot line, which eliminates the portion of the planter that is currently on the project site. It appears the remainder is simply shown as part of existing surrounding conditions. Provide a note on this sheet to clarify what is being proposed after partial demo.

Response: The existing turf island and concrete curb on the City lot will remain. As noted on Sheet C4.0, landscaping within the turf area may be provided with approval by the property owner (City).

Comment 19. Sheet C4.0: What is proposed between the brick sidewalk and concrete sidewalk at southwest corner of Broad and Lawton Streets – brick, concrete, landscaping?

Response: That area is currently shown as turf.

Comment 20. The CDP shows on-street parking along E. Broad Street. At this time the City does not have a plan for on-street parking along Broad. The future success of such proposal is unclear due to potential impacts to vehicular movement on Broad. Additionally, the 20 foot setback along Broad and Washington Streets is measured from the face of curb, existing and/or proposed. Any potential reduction in streetscape width and the 9 to 10-foot clear pedestrian way that may be impacted by on-street parking will need to be considered. Lastly, are these spaces included in the 600 parking tabulation provided for the project?

Response: As discussed above, the on-street parking has been removed in the base plan, but is still included as an alternative subject to City approval. In the base condition all streetscape guidelines are met. The on-street parking spaces were not included in the parking tab.

Comment 21. Sheet C6.0: The required building setback along Broad and Washington Streets is 20 feet measured from the face of curb [§48-1101, footnote (11)].

Sheet C6.0 shows some areas between planters and building along E. Broad Street as measuring 5 to 7 feet in width. The proposed streetscape on N. Washington and E. Broad Streets is not consistent with the recently adopted Streetscape Design Standards for Commercial Streets. See relevant comments below from Transportation Planning.

Response: The plans have been revised to be in conformance with the streetscape standards.

Comment 22. Sheets C6.0 & C7.0: The recently adopted Streetscape Design Standards for Commercial Streets recommends the following for typical streetscape section on Broad and Washington Streets – 4 feet for building zone, 9 feet for pedestrian zone with raised-edge planters and 10 feet with flush planters, and 6 feet for amenity zone. The standards recommend minimum length of 14 feet for planter beds. The planter beds shown on Sheets C6.0 and C7.0 measure 12 feet in length. See new standards for additional recommendations on other streetscape elements.

Response: The plans have been revised to be in conformance with the streetscape standards.

Comment 23. Sheets C7.1: All Streetscape furniture will need to be consistent with the current streetscape standards.

Response: The plans have been revised to be in conformance with the streetscape standards.

Comment 24. Sheet C8.0: Roadway Frontage Exhibit – proposed areas of dedication and easement are noted as shown.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 25. Sheet C9.0: Page 9 of the Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book states “no public parking is proposed inside the garage”, but on Sheet C9.0 of CDP, 105 spaces in the P1 is labeled as Retail and Public Parking. Are there any public parking proposed within the project aside from the on-street?

Response: As discussed above, the applicant anticipates instituting a pay parking system that would allow the public to park for a fee.

Comment 26. Revise the CDP and Conceptual Floor Plans and Parking Levels in Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book to comply with the applicable new requirements adopted in Ord. 1946, including but not limited to, non-encroachment of columns, utilities, bollards, etc., and bicycle parking standards.

Response: Final design of the building and parking garage will comply with Ordinance 1946.

Comment 27. Add name and address of the present record owner of the tract and a statement that the owner or contract owner joins in the site plan and agrees to be bound by all site plan requirements. If any person represents the owner, the owner must provide a statement of that person's authority. [§48-1137(4)]

Response: This information will be provided at the time of site plan.

Comment 28. Draft VCs were submitted. Attached are the Voluntary Concessions that were recently approved for the Mason Row project. At the request of the City Manager, these should be used as the standard VC template for consideration in preparing future VC documents. See below for specific staff comments on VC related items (Planning & Development #31-34; Transportation Planning #2, 9, 15, 18, 25; Department of Public Work #17-19; Environmental Programs #2, Health & Human Services #2 & 3). Future meetings with City management are anticipated to finalize the VCs.

Response: Updated VCs are included with this resubmission. We anticipate additional meetings with City staff will be needed to finalize the VCs.

Comment 29. Please reconcile the differences in number of dwelling units, parking spaces, and use square footages between and within the submitted documents (CDP, Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book, Fiscal Impact Analysis data sheet, shared parking study, traffic impact analysis).

Response: The CDP, Rezoning and Special Exception Review Book, and Fiscal Impact Analysis data sheet include the correct, reduced number of units. Because of the compressed resubmission schedule, the shared parking study and traffic impact analysis have not yet incorporated the lower number of units. However, the reduction in units should improve the overall performance of the shared parking and traffic.

Comment 30. Special exceptions criteria references and justifications will need to be revised and resubmitted as the draft VC's undergo review and updates.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 31. Include massing, additional perspectives of the north elevation and sun shadow studies in future submissions.

Response: Additional elevations and perspectives are provided in the Rezoning and Special Exception Review Book.

Comment 32. The consideration of a mid-block access pathway between E. Broad Street and Park Place within the project site should be strongly considered. An example of an interior public pathway is the near complete Rushmark building at 301 W. Broad Street. An example of an exterior public pathway is located in the Spectrum development at the 400 block of W. Broad Street.

Response: See above for a description of the enhanced pedestrian connection between E. Broad Street and the City parking lot.

Comment 33. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book, pages 14-15: in future submissions, where step backs are provided per required by the code, indicate height and depth of step backs. Additionally, please include a key plan on the building elevation sheets.

Response: The elevations have been updated accordingly.

Comment 34. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book, page 17: the courtyards shown on the building sections are misleading as it could appear that they are all along the exterior of the proposed building. This page should be revised with "internal courtyard" labels and graphical representation of the foreground building portions where appropriate.

Response: The elevations have been updated accordingly. As a note, the key provided on Page 17 now clearly shows where the cross-section is cut through the building.

Comment 35. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book, page 16: The middle section of the north elevation appears to be one continuous flat plane. Provide additional perspectives and massing studies for this elevation to show any

variations or reliefs if any on the building surface.

Response: Additional elevations showing the building articulation, at-risk windows, and public art are included.

Comment 36. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book, page 17: in future submissions provide a small overview plan with section cut label on the same page for reference, in addition to providing the section cut label in subsequent pages.

Response: Acknowledged and included.

Comment 37. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book, page 21 & 22: Page 21 is labeled P2 Level and subsequently, page 22 is labeled P4 Level. Please correct labeling or provide missing page in future submissions.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 38. The Walker Shared Parking Analysis assumes 50 seats for the proposed performance arts theater. Is this an accurate assumption based on the current capacity of Creative Cauldron?

Response: That is an error in the Walker study. The correct assumption is 100 seats. The overall analysis from Walker does not change materially based on the corrected number.

Comment 39. The requested Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Plan Map change is from "Business" and "Transitional" to "Mixed-Use." The justification provided by the applicant for the proposed Broad and Washington mixed-use project is based on general goals and strategies identified for the Downtown/City Center Opportunity area. The site is identified for potential redevelopment in the Comprehensive Plan (Figure 4-12) and the proposed project would provide a mixed-use development with a significant increase in net commercial square footage at the intersection of the two major commercial corridors in the City (Ch. 4, Goal 3). The project would also result in the consolidation of parcels to be developed with a multi-story building and structured parking (Ch. 4, Goals 10, 12, 14). Future submissions should also focus on the following goals and strategies:

- *Chapter 4, Goal 8, Strategy A: Create well-designed transitions between residential and commercial districts, and require appropriate*

buffering between commercial and residential areas to protect neighborhoods from the negative impacts of noise, traffic, light, odors, and visual incompatibility. The existing “Transitional” designated parcel is intended to provide a buffer or transitional use between commercial and residential uses. With the request for an amendment to designate the entire site to “Mixed-Use”, improvement is needed to provide an effective transitional area through buffers, setbacks, step backs and building design.

- *Chapter 4, Goal 3, Strategies A & B: Encourage efficient land utilization adjacent to ... major thoroughfares ... with development that is compatible with the residential nature of the City. Encourage mixed-use development to move persons closer to business and shopping areas.* The proposed location of the 6-story office building at the intersection of Broad and Washington Streets is an improvement; higher density commercial uses are encouraged at the intersection of Broad and Washington Streets; however increasing the commercial to residential ratio should be strongly considered. Improvement is also needed to create an effective transition between the project and surrounding residential uses.

- *Chapter 4, Goal 1, Strategy B: Encourage redevelopment that enhances the City’s character, while providing economic stability and environmental quality.*

Chapter 5, Goal 2, Strategy G: Continue to work with applicants during the development review process to minimize impervious surface areas and to mitigate the effects of runoff from impervious areas post-construction

Chapter 5, Goal 4, Strategy E: Increase vegetative cover and tree canopy on rooftops and in parking areas to provide shade and reduce impervious surfaces.

Greater detail should be paid to minimizing the amount of impervious surfaces, providing native landscaping, and other techniques to enhance the environmental quality.

Response: The statement of justification has been updated to incorporate these comments.

Comment 40. The Downtown Falls Church Small Area Plan includes the project site in the Core Entertainment Area (CEA), which is a focused area of dense retail businesses with supporting residential and hotel space. Some residential use

is acceptable in the CEA in the form of loft apartments above retail establishments. The Plan also states that *“building scale and massing must be compatible with adjacent historic buildings and residential neighborhoods. Appropriate architectural design, tapering toward adjacent lower density residential neighborhoods, and buffers must be used in the design of new development”*.

Response: This project proposes the most significant, Class A, office building in the City. As discussed, we believe in the City’s office market. However, the ability to actually deliver on the proposed office, commercial, and theater space is completely dependent upon the critical mass of residential being proposed. This project works because of the complementary uses being proposed. If the residential component of the project is reduced, the office, retail, and theater components as proposed are no longer viable.

As discussed in detail above, the project is designed to be compatible with the adjacent residential neighborhoods through the use of massing, setbacks, and height step-downs.

Comment 41. At a minimum, the following elements contained in the City’s Design Guidelines should be evaluated and incorporated into the project to the greatest extent possible:

- Guidelines for Site Elements, Massing and Building Footprint – use techniques to reduce perceived mass of large buildings;
- Connectivity between Sites and Parking – provide clear pedestrian paths and crossings from parking spaces to main building entrances and street; and
- Guidelines for Commercial and Office Buildings – stepped back heights and varied wall surfaces, avoid monolithic expanse of roof.

Response: All of the above elements within the City’s Design Guidelines have been evaluated and incorporated in the project. The building mass has been broken up significantly through the use of courtyards and step-backs. The site contains direct connections between parking areas and the proposed uses. The office portion of the project has stepped back heights and varied wall surfaces.

Comment 42. The rezoning of the existing T-1 parcel to B-2 to allow for the consolidation of the entire site for the proposed mixed-use development,

and to achieve the height bonus allowed for the B-2 zone is a rational approach. However, since the existing T-1 parcel is abutting an R-district to the immediate north, the justification for the rezoning will rely heavily on the overall compatibility of the project that includes contextual sensitivity, visual impact, and appropriate buffer and transition to the residential zone. The current proposal shows a step back at 64 feet which is improvement. However, future submissions will need to consider greater buffering and step backs with heights consistent with a Transitional zoned parcel along those areas of the site adjacent to the residential neighborhood along Lawton Street.

Response: As discussed in detail above, the revised plan shows multiple step-downs in height as the building approaches the R district. These include step-downs at 20 feet and 45 feet on the Lawton frontage. Those step-downs are compatible with the 35 foot maximum height in the R district and 55 foot maximum height in the T-1 district.

Comment 43. As discussed above, the following items should be considered and included in future submissions for the project to be in greater conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, Downtown Falls Church Small Area Plan, and Design Guidelines (Primary Criteria): well-designed transition between the project site and adjacent residential neighborhood with appropriate buffering, setbacks, and step backs; further reduction in perceived massing; clear and accessible pedestrian pathways within the site and to adjacent sites, particularly in relation to City owned public parking spaces; additional environmental components such as minimization of impervious surfaces, green roofs, and other low impact development techniques.

Response: See above responses.

Comment 44. Staff evaluation and review based on primary and secondary special exception criteria will continue to be provided as the Voluntary Concessions and other project elements are revised and refined to address staff comments included in this letter and feedback from future public meetings.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 45. The special exception criteria in section 48-488 regarding "exemplary" projects specifically requires appropriate step backs for any height bonus

consideration in a B-2 district that abuts an R-district. This requirement is applicable for portions of the site adjacent to R-district along Lawton Street. Step backs should be provided at 35 feet (or adjacent structure height) in addition to the proposed step backs at 65 feet along Lawton, which satisfies the requirement for step backs at 75 feet (maximum by right height of the B-2 district). Additionally, the heights of all structures abutting an R-district are to be “tapered to be compatible with the maximum allowed heights, in both districts.” Design of the building elevations abutting the R-district should take into consideration appropriate buffer and transitional elements to achieve compatibility. Proposed buildings have specific step back considerations when adjacent to (R), residential districts at both maximum adjacent residential district height and subject site B-2, business district maximum height by right. In future submissions, where step backs are provided per the code, indicate height and depth of steps backs.

Response: As discussed above, the project has step backs at 20 feet, 45 feet, and 65 feet. Those step backs are compatible with the maximum 35 foot height in the adjacent R district.

Comment 46. “Exemplary” project evaluation will continue to be evaluated against the primary and secondary criteria, Voluntary Concessions and other project elements as they are revised and refined.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 47. The special exception criteria in section 48-488 regarding “preferred uses” will continue to be determined as the Voluntary Concessions and other project elements are revised and refined.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 48. See memorandum, dated May 10, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 1).

Response: Acknowledged.

Transportation Planning

Comment 49. Streetscape Standards Reference The Voluntary Concessions reference the City’s previous streetscape standards. The Concessions should be updated

to reflect the latest standards. (Voluntary Concession #2)

Response: As discussed above, the current base plan meets the City's current streetscape standards.

Comment 50. Streetscape Cross Sections The proposed streetscape cross section does not match the standards described in the City's streetscape standards. The typical streetscape cross section for Broad and Washington is 6' amenity zone, 10' pedestrian zone, 4' building zone. Wider cross section are encouraged. Parallel parking is not an anticipated use in the amenity zone. (Sheet C4.0)

Response: As discussed above, the current base plan meets the City's current streetscape standards.

Comment 51 Street Tree Spacing of street trees should be tightened to 28 foot spacing to match the City's standards. (Sheet C5.0)

Response: Acknowledged and included in revised plans.

Comment 52 Street Furniture Standards The proposed street furniture should be updated to match the City's standards (Sheet C7.01)

Response: Acknowledged and included in revised plans.

Comment 53. Street Furniture Spacing Street furniture should be spaced and oriented consistent with the City's standards. In particular, benches, street cans, bike racks, and lightning should be updated. (Sheet C5.0)

Response: Acknowledged and included in revised plans.

Comment 54. Crosswalks Spacing The block length from N Washington Street to Lawton Street is approximately 650 feet. The City's streetscape standards call for crosswalks every 250 feet. A location for a midblock crossing should be identified and a refuge island should be provided. Additionally, a marked crosswalk should be added at the intersection with Lawton Street. (Sheet C5.0)

Response: Acknowledged and included in revised plans.

Comment 55. Crosswalk Materials Crosswalk materials should be pavers. This should include updates to the intersection of Broad Street & Washington Street.

(Sheet C5.0)

Response: Acknowledged and included in revised plans.

Comment 56. Streetscape Maintenance The voluntary concessions should include a provision for development of a streetscape maintenance agreement to be approved during site plan. (Voluntary Concessions)

Response: Acknowledged and included in revised VCs.

Comment 57. Lawton Sidewalk Why is the sidewalk angled relative to the curb, is it for tree root protection? Buffer space should be added between the sidewalk and the building face. Why does the sidewalk appear to “hook” as it approaches the intersection of Lawton St & E Broad St? (sheet C4.1)

Response: The sidewalk is designed to protect the existing street trees on Lawton Street. Turf and planting beds are provided between the sidewalk and the building. The sidewalk is designed to be ADA accessible, which required the “hook” to accommodate the overall grade change.

Comment 58. Lawton Curb Extension A curb extension should be constructed for the northeast corner of the intersection. This could be incorporated into a neighborhood gateway feature. (Sheet C4.0)

Response: The applicant is open to studying this option.

Comment 59. Garage ADA Access The ADA pathway from the garage to N Washington Street should be marked on the Conceptual Development Plan to confirm feasibility before site plan. (C9.0)

Response: No ADA access from the garage directly to N. Washington Street is provided. Alternative ADA pathways are provided from the garage to E. Broad Street.

Comment 60. Bicycle Parking Tabulation The City’s zoning ordinance requires short term and long term, secure bicycle parking. The parking tabulation should be updated to include bicycle parking tabulations. (Sheet C2.0)

Response: Bicycle parking will be provided in conformance with requirements. A commitment to bicycle parking is included in the updated VCs.

- Comment 61. Secure Bike Parking The residential secure bike parking area is located on a lower level of the garage. The access path to the bike parking should be marked on the plan sheets. (Sheet C9.0)
- Response: Access to the bike storage area will be provided via the garage elevator and through the garage ramping system.
- Comment 62. Bike Share Operating Support The City is actively working to expand bike-share in the City. As part of reducing demand for automobile parking, the project should commit to annual operating support for a bike-share station for the life of the project. (Voluntary Concession #10)
- Response: Bike share locations are shown on the CDP and included as a commitment in the VCs. A commitment to long term operating costs will need to be discussed in the context of the overall monetary commitments being provided in this project.
- Comment 63. Bike Share Station Location A bike-share location should be identified on the Conceptual Development Plan. (sheet C5.0)
- Response: Acknowledged and included in revised plans.
- Comment 64. Bus Shelters The proposed bus stops should incorporate the City's standard bus shelters, as opposed to using just benches. (Sheet C5.0)
- Response: Acknowledged and included in revised plans.
- Comment 65. TDM Goals The Voluntary Concessions should include specific goals for the TDM and PMP plans. These goals should specify the following: (1) Target transportation mode share, (2) Target automobile trip reduction from ITE standards, and (3) Target automobile parking reduction from City standards. (Voluntary Concession #5)
- Response: A TDM commitment will be included in the VCs. A meeting with the City's transportation planner has been requested to discuss the TDM plan.
- Comment 66. TDM Template City staff has developed a standard TDM template for organizing TDM packages. The proposed TDM should be broken into the following four categories (1) site design, infrastructure, and options, (2) promotion, education, and incentives, (3) monitoring and enforcement, (4) adaptive management. A conceptual TDM should be provided during

Special Exception and be finalized as part of Site Plan approval. (No TDM Provided)

Response: A TDM commitment will be included in the VCs. A meeting with the City's transportation planner has been requested to discuss the TDM plan.

Comment 67. Lane Widths The pavement lane widths appear to be standardized at 11'. For the outside lanes, this results an effective lane width of 13'. Please confirm that the gutter is 2' wide and that a 2' wide gutter is needed. (Sheet C4.0)

Response: Confirmed.

Comment 68. Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) The following should be updated in the TIA:

- a. LOS A callout box should be included in the executive summary describing automobile Level of Service (LOS), what LOS is typical in this kind of environment, and how automobile LOS is related to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access (Page 4)
- b. Planned Transit The list of planned transportation improvements should be updated to note that the City's Comprehensive Plan calls for increasing transit frequency on both Broad Street and Washington Street to provide 15-minute all day service. (Page 5)
- c. Bicycle Master Plan The reference to the City's Bicycle Master Plan should be updated to reflect that the plan has been adopted. (Page 10)
- d. Transit Service The table of bus information should be expanded to include a column for off-peak service frequency and all service frequencies should be updated to reflect recent service changes. (Pages 12-13)

Response: The TIA is being updated to reflect these changes and the current reduced unit count.

Zoning

Comment 69. See memorandum, dated April 25, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 2)

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 70. The methodology for computing the building height is correct.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 71. There are two light poles proposed within the vision triangle: One nearest the vehicle entrance/exit along N. Washington and one nearest the vehicle entrance/exit along E. Broad; both impact the vision of a driver exiting the garage and looking to the left. Staff notes the vision triangle has been applied to the surface street intersections, but not to the intersection of the garage access with the street. Apply the vision triangle to the garage exits and relocate these poles.

Response: Light poles have been relocated.

Comment 72. Confirm the proposed residential parking is dedicated to the residential users and is not shared or mixed with the commercial.

Response: Confirmed.

Comment 73. The dimensions for parking spaces recently changed. Refer to the table in Sec. 48-933(a) for parking space width (9 feet) and drive aisle width, and to Sec. 48-933(b)(7)-(8) regarding prohibited encroachments into parking spaces.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 74. Note: As a point of clarification moving forward, the applicant is advised not to offer additional parking spaces for sale to either residential or commercial users during leasing or sale unless those spaces are identified on the proposed plan and have been included in the parking tabulations as above and beyond the minimum required.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 75. Provide a construction parking plan that locates construction trailers and provides for the parking of the construction crew and related staff.

Response: Acknowledged and included in the VCs.

Comment 76. Clarify the proposed location of the transformers and utility equipment, which appear to have moved to near the Lawton frontage. If these will be located below grade, no waiver is required; if these will be located above grade and within 3 feet of a side property line or within 14 feet of the face of curb along Lawton, a setback variance is required, not a waiver. Variances require a recommendation from the Planning Commission, and approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals. Revise requested waivers on Sheet C2.0.

Response: Transformers are not proposed within 3 feet of a side property line or within 14 feet of the face of curb along Lawton Street.

Comment 77. The modifications requested to Sec. 48-1101 for setbacks along Lawton Street require variances rather than modifications. Application can be made to the Board of Zoning Appeals, with a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Revise requested waivers on Sheet C2.0.

Response: The proposed building is setback a minimum of 22 feet from the edge of curb, which we believe is an appropriate and compatible setback from Lawton Street. Additionally, the Zoning Ordinance Section 48-1101 note 11 provides that front yard setbacks are "20 feet for commercially-zoned properties (B, M, T) with frontage on the following streets: Broad Street and Washington Street. These requirements may be reduced; by the planning commission as part of a site plan review or by city council as part of a special exception. Distance shall be measured from the face of the curb, to the narrowest point of the face of the building." This property is seeking zoning to the B-2 zoning district and is therefore commercially zoned. Additionally, the property has frontage on Broad Street and Washington Street. Under a plain reading of the zoning ordinance, the property has a required front yard setback of 20 feet measured from the face of curb to the narrowest point of the face of building.

Our review of prior City approvals for Mason Row, Rushmark, The Reserve at Tinner Hill, and the Kensington show that this is the consistent application the setback requirements for properties with frontage on Broad Street and Washington Street. In each of the above cited cases, the building setback was less than 14 feet from the property line on the non-Broad/Washington street frontages. We are not aware of any variances that were required for those properties and the approved setbacks. If we are incorrect and variances were approved, could you please forward us copies

of those variances. This project should receive the same application of the zoning ordinance as the prior projects which are all similarly situated.

We have continued to include a variance request related to the Lawton Street frontage at your request, but do not believe such a variance is needed based upon the plain language of the ordinance.

Comment 78. Continue to develop a uniform sign package as the project advances. Sign packages require approval by the AAB. Buildings of this scope typically require variances for the number and size of signs. Sign variances are heard by the AAB for recommendation and the Board of Zoning Appeals for determination.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 79. This application requires a site plan review by the Architectural Advisory Board (AAB), for recommendation to the Planning Commission. That board meets the first Wednesday of each month. Contact the Zoning Office for placement on the agenda.

Response: Acknowledged. We anticipate filing a site plan application after approval of the rezoning and special exceptions are approved.

Comment 80. Screen all roof-mounted utilities from pedestrian view.

Response: Acknowledged. All roof-mounted utilities are not visible to pedestrians.

Comment 81. Continue to anticipate the need for special use permit approval of roof-mounted wireless communications equipment. These will require a special use permit, with a recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals. Staff suggests the applicant simplify that process by including a concurrent application for a special use permit that will pre-approve the building for such installations. The primary review criteria have been that such installations not have any ground-based equipment and that roof-based equipment be screened from pedestrian view. Zoning staff can assist in framing that request.

Response: The applicant anticipates filing a concurrent SE for this use.

Department of Public Works

Comment 82. See memorandum, dated May 11, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 3).

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 83. The City still does not recommend installing an additional traffic signal along East Broad Street for the site driveway. The forecasted level of service at this intersection makes a number of assumptions that may or may not be realistic given that the driveway is currently full-access and motorists find ways to navigate into and out of the site without a traffic signal in the existing condition.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 84. Submit appendices with final copy of TIA for City records.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 85. In addition to the requirements set forth in the SWM Ordinance, the City requests at least the first inch of rainfall be retained on-site through infiltration, evapotranspiration and/or reuse. Where demonstrated to not be fully achievable, all available measures should be implemented to the extent possible in order to support the goal and achieve partial retention of the first inch of rainfall. This should be included in the voluntary concessions.

Response: The applicant is open to discussing additional SWM controls, however, retaining the first inch of rainfall on-site is not achievable for this site.

Comment 86. The intersection of East Broad Street and Lawton Street currently holds water for 2-3 days after rain events. Adjustments to the curb on East Broad Street must account for this and be designed to eliminate the ponding at this intersection.

Response: We are currently reviewing this issue.

Comment 87. Lawton – Provide 4 or more feet between the sidewalk and the building front, per the FC streetscape standards for side streets. The plan as shown has no elbow room for pedestrians where the Creative Cauldron space abuts the 6' sidewalk. The straightened sidewalk as shown will be good for

the existing trees.

Response: The sidewalk was provided against the Creative Cauldron space to give the existing trees additional room, which will increase survivability. A significant comment we received was to retain the street trees on Lawton Street. Achieving that goal requires the sidewalk in its current location.

Comment 88. Broad – Where on-street parking is shown, the building setback on Broad is less than 20 feet. Please adhere to city streetscape standards which show a minimum setback of 20 feet, with the planters closer to the curb. The trees will not perform well if placed too close to the building.

Response: See revised plans showing no on-street parking in the base option.

Comment 89. In the site plan, the Broad Street planters should have a continuous corridor of soil beneath the pavement (between planters) wherever possible.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 90. In the site plan, please be sure to keep utilities under the sidewalk, and not under the planters.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 91. The site plan should include the streetscape irrigation plan.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 92. The site plan should include a single sheet showing proposed tree locations together with outdoor lighting and security camera locations, to ensure that they interact well.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 93. The content of the 20' buffer between the proposed project and the adjacent single-family home is not clearly shown: will the planted area be 10 feet wide, or more? Reconsider the sidewalk location, to allow elbow room between it and the building wall.

Response: Additional details on the buffer have been provided.

Comment 94. Update the Limits of Disturbance and show existing conditions for all areas

which will not be modified with this project (i.e., the median along N Washington St).

Response: Acknowledged and included on plans.

Comment 95. Streetlights adjacent to the site shall be LEDs and the distribution shall be TY III or TY IV, depending upon the photometric analysis performed for the Site Plan. Lighting at intersections in the City is TY V.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 96. The proposed retail use suggests the need for trash and recycling receptacles in the streetscape. Aside from the set of trash and recycling receptacles proposed at each bus stop, one or two additional sets are likely needed to capture the expected waste. Please identify the locations of all street trash and recycling receptacles.

Response: Additional locations will be shown as site plan.

Comment 97. The City maintains one of the highest recycling rates in the state. Recycling is required for both multi-family and commercial properties per the Solid Waste chapter of the City's Code (Chapter 34). Subsequent submissions should make it clear that a recycling system for all residents and tenants will be implemented. Include pertinent details, such as how recycling will be handled in trash rooms on each floor (if applicable) -- and how/where recycling will be consolidated and collected in the loading areas.

Response: Recycling in conformance with City Code will be provided.

Comment 98. To compensate for the loss of the buffer planter, provide a planted buffer between the city's surface parking lot and the building to make up for the buffer planter to be removed.

Response: Additional plantings will be provided with permission from the City as owner of the property.

Comment 99. Replace the two non-decorative signal poles at the intersection of Broad and Washington St.

Response: We do not anticipate replacement of these signal poles based on the other significant commitments being made as part of this project.

Comment 100. Pave one travel lane immediately adjacent to the site frontage along N Washington St and along Lawton St. Pave the westbound lanes and the turn lane (approximately 35' from the face of curb) along E Broad St. Reconfigure the turn lanes to provide access to the driveways along the 100 block of E Broad, including the site driveway.

Response: The applicant does not anticipate that repaving is necessitated by the proposed project. If construction results in damage to public roadways, the applicant will be responsible for repairing that damage, which may include repaving if needed.

Environmental Programs

Comment 101. See email, dated May 11, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 4).

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 102. Please confirm that both buildings will be LEED certified. Which LEED points will they pursue for certification?

Response: The building will be LEED certified. As provided in the VCs, the actual points being pursued will be determined by a LEED consultant.

Comment 103. What energy efficiency measures will be included in the building design? Will these be EnergyStar certified buildings?

Response: Energy efficiency measures will be provided as part of the LEED certification for the buildings.

Comment 104. The description of the parking on p.3 states that people parking in their lot will be able to access "all surrounding attractions", but on p.6 it seems to be limited to on-site uses. Can they confirm that patrons will also be able to visit sites outside their project without moving their vehicles?

Response: We anticipate instituting a pay parking system for the garage, which will allow the public to park on-site for a fee regardless of whether they patronize a business on site.

Comment 105. The number of permanent jobs noted in the submission is 366, but I think that does not accord with what was presented on Tuesday.

Response: The fiscal impact analysis submitted to the City for the project anticipates 366 permanent jobs.

Comment 106. I suggest considering a shuttle to Metro as part of the TDM to minimize vehicular traffic.

Response: A meeting to discuss the TDM plan has been requested.

Comment 107. I was very pleased to hear that the developer is considering adding renewable energy sources such as solar power.

Response: A commitment to explore solar options is included in the VCs.

Housing and Human Services

Comment 108. See memorandum, dated May 16, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 5).

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 109. In line with the City of Falls Church Affordable Housing Policy, a minimum of 6% of units should be proffered as Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs). They should be the same mix as the entire project although the City has a preference for studios that can be offered at a lower rent and larger units with den or two or more bedrooms. The supply of one bedroom ADUs in the City is currently sufficient to meet the need. All units should be affordable to households with incomes at 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI). No amenities fees shall be charged to ADU residents.

Response: This commitment is included in the VCs.

Comment 110. The developer's proposal to set 1/3 of the rents affordable to households at 80% of the AMI and 1/3 at 100% of the AMI is unacceptable.

Response: See revised VCs.

Economic Development

Comment 111. See Fiscal Impact Analysis, dated May 16, 2017 (Enclosure 6).

Response: Acknowledged.

Building Safety

Comment 112. See memorandum, dated May 17, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 7).

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 113. Please submit a description of the structure.

Response:

Comment 114. Please submit a code analysis and life safety plan.

Response: To be provided at site plan.

Comment 115. Please submit a LEED check list.

Response: To be provided at site plan.

Comment 116. Please submit a fire flow calculation.

Response: To be provided at site plan.

Comment 117. Please note that openings in walls in close proximity to the property line must comply with Table 602 and Section 705.8.

Response: A building code modification for wall openings will be provided.

Comment 118. Please verify that there will be an accessible route from accessible retail parking spaces to each of the retail tenant spaces.

Response: The plans will meet all building and fire code requirements.

Comment 119. For community resilience and safety during extended power outages we recommend a "Building Generator" voluntary concession to power the following:

- a. Fire alarm,
- b. Exit lights,
- c. Emergency lighting,
- d. Night lighting,
- e. Domestic water pumps,
- f. At least one elevator in each building,

g. Fire pump, if required.

Response: The applicant is comfortable committing to back up systems, but would like to discuss the exact scope with the Fire Marshal prior to inclusion in the VCs.

Comment 120. Please consider providing a Fire Control Room for the residential building with direct access from the outside.

Response: The applicant is exploring this as an option.

Fire Official

Comment 121. See memorandum, dated May 18, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 8).

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 122 Identify high-rise fire protection package: The building footprint with parking will impose a challenge for fire/rescue units due to the limited accessibility for the Fire Department. A clear definition of the intent of providing a high-rise fire protection package shall be clearly stated. This shall include all typical components including, but not limited to, generator, pressurized stairwells, fire pump, monitored alarm system and fire command center.

Response: The applicant anticipates further discussion of the high-rise protection package with the Building Official.

Comment 123. Show location of Fire System components and rooms: fire control room, fire pump room, electrical rooms, generator location, and chemical room (if equipped with a swimming pool), fire hydrant locations, fire enunciator panel, main fire control panel, FDC location and fire pump test intake location.

Response: To be provided at site plan.

Comment 124. Location of Fire Department Connection (FDC): Shall be within 75 feet of the fire hydrant. Design planning shall accommodate that fire hose, when connected between the hydrant location and the FDC, remains unobstructed. No streetscape, bus shelters, bike racks or outdoor café shall

obstruct this area. Fire hose when deployed from the FDC to the hydrant location shall not cross roadways, driveways to/from a parking garage, or egress/access points into or away from the structure.

Response: To be provided at site plan

Comment 125. Building Egress and Access Points: Design planning should provide that ALL egress and access points provide egress away from the building without obstructions. No streetscape, bus shelters, bike racks shall obstruct the means of egress away from the building.

Response: To be provided at site plan

Comment 126. Streetscape: The Fire Official shall review and approve all streetscape to assure interoperability for the building egress, emergency responder operations and unhampered access to building systems.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 127. Radio Coverage Compliance: Public Safety Radio Coverage Compliance, this requirement is not only for the underground parking garage but includes coverage requirements inside and aboveground in the building to include stairwells. The space and amplification equipment shall be provided and maintained by the building owner. Certification by a Professional Engineer shall be provided showing the testing of signal strength and coverage has been met prior to the final C.O. being issued. The City Fire Official is the point of coordination for all city emergency services for approval of radio compliance.

Response: Acknowledged and included in the VCs.

Comment 128. Emergency Generators: Shall have a generator sized accordingly to supply and sustain fire protection systems, emergency lighting, exit lights, Public Safety Radio amplification systems, fire pump if required, at least one elevator service per building, sump pumps as well as domestic water in order to sustain sanitary systems and other critical functions that are to remain viable during extended outages. Generators are preferred to be natural gas supplied (diesel generators are limited by fuel supply; will also require annual permits).

- Response: The applicant is comfortable committing to back up systems, but would like to discuss the exact scope with the Fire Marshal prior to inclusion in the VCs.
- Comment 129. Underground Garages: The use of private delivery services for personal vehicle refueling in the underground parking garage is prohibited, exception: Services such as emergency road service in the delivery of fuel of 5 gallons or less.
- Response: Acknowledged.
- Comment 130. Designated Fire Lanes: Fire Lanes for emergency response shall be designated by Fire Official and shall be marked according to code.
- Response: Acknowledged.
- Comment 131. Signage: Signage will be required throughout the building in accordance with requirements set by the Fire Official. This shall include identification of all exterior doors on ground level, stair and floor level landings inside stairwells, equipment rooms and FDC location. FDC shall be equipped with a "red (nonauditable) strobe light above the FDC that activates during alarm mode.
- Response: Acknowledged.
- Comment 132. Access for Fire Apparatus including Medic Units: If it is anticipated that emergency vehicles will enter into a covered structure, applicant must supply detailed specifications to meet clearance and weight requirements for fire apparatus including medic units. This includes height, width, turning radius and weight support.
- Response: Acknowledged.
- Comment 133. Fire Dept Knox Box(s): Shall be installed where designated by Fire Official.
- Response: Acknowledged.
- Comment 134. Parking Spaces: The project shall have a least two designated parking spaces for POLICE - FIRE MARSHAL needs (including signage).

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment 135. Pre-Construction Meeting: A Pre-Construction meeting will be required to review the requirements of chapter 33 of the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code.

Response: Acknowledged.

Sincerely,


Scott E. Adams